



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/45/298
S/21339
31 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-fifth session
Item 35 of the preliminary list*
THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-fifth year

Letter dated 31 May 1990 from the Permanent Representative of
Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon the instructions of my Government, and further to its statement dated 22 May 1990 (A/45/286), I would like to elaborate the position of the Government of Japan on the recent wave of violence in the occupied territories and particularly the shooting of Palestinian people by an Israeli civilian on 20 May.

The Government of Japan extends its sincere condolences to the Palestinians who were injured and to the families of those killed in the massacre by an Israeli civilian in Rishon le Zion on 20 May and in the ensuing popular protests.

The Government of Japan deplores the shooting as a senseless and brutal act which claimed the lives of innocent people. It denounces the excessive force with which the Israeli authorities reacted to the subsequent popular demonstration of anger.

This killing of innocent people has exacerbated a situation where tensions had already been heightened by the question of the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

Profoundly concerned about the escalation of violence, the Government of Japan demands that the Government of Israel exercise maximum self-restraint in dealing with the Palestinians in the occupied territories and that it treat them with full humanitarian consideration in accordance with international law. The Government of Japan urges the United Nations to take effective action in order to secure their just treatment.

* A/45/50.

At the root of this tragic situation is the fact that the provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) have not been implemented and that peace in the Middle East remains an elusive goal.

In the mean time, the Palestinians in the occupied territories have been forced to endure conditions of severe political, economic and social hardship. In order to free them from these conditions and to prevent the recurrence of such tragic incidents, it is imperative that a just, lasting and comprehensive peace be achieved, with Israel's withdrawal from all the territories it has occupied since 1967. Toward this end, Japan hopes that a new Israel Government will be formed as quickly as possible and that it will respond in good faith to the efforts made by the parties concerned toward an early achievement of peace in the Middle East.

I should be grateful if you would arrange to have this letter circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under item 35 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yoshio HATANO
Ambassador Extraordinary
and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of
Japan to the United Nations



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/21340
31 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS
OPERATION IN CYPRUS

(for the period 1 December 1989-31 May 1990)

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1	2
I. MANDATE AND COMPOSITION OF UNFICYP	2 - 6	2
II. RELATIONS WITH THE PARTIES	7	3
III. FUNCTIONS OF UNFICYP	8 - 27	4
A. Maintenance of the cease-fire and the <u>status quo</u>	8 - 17	4
B. Restoration of normal conditions and humanitarian functions	18 - 27	5
IV. COMMITTEE ON MISSING PERSONS	28	7
V. FINANCIAL ASPECTS	29 - 32	7
VI. GOOD OFFICES OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL	33	8
VII. OBSERVATIONS	34 - 38	8
<u>Annex.</u> Press communiqué issued by the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus on 11 April 1990		10
<u>Map.</u> Deployment of UNFICYP, May 1990		

INTRODUCTION

1. The present report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus covers developments from 1 December 1989 to 31 May 1990 and brings up to date the record of activities of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) and the Secretary-General's mission of good offices pursuant to Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964 and subsequent Council resolutions concerning Cyprus. In its resolution 646 (1989) of 14 December 1989, the Security Council called upon all the parties concerned to continue to co-operate with UNFICYP on the basis of the present mandate. It also requested the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices, to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report on the implementation of the resolution by 31 May 1990.

I. MANDATE AND COMPOSITION OF UNFICYP

2. The function of UNFICYP was originally defined by the Security Council in its resolution 186 (1964) in the following terms:

"In the interest of preserving international peace and security, to use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions."

That mandate, which was conceived in the context of the confrontation between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities in 1964, has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the Council, most recently in its resolution 646 (1989). In connection with the events that have occurred since 15 July 1974, the Council has adopted a number of resolutions, some of which have affected the functioning of UNFICYP and, in some cases, have required the Force to perform certain additional or modified functions relating, in particular, to the maintenance of the cease-fire (see S/14275, para. 7, note).

3. The table below shows the establishment of UNFICYP as at 31 May 1990:

<u>Military personnel</u>			
Austria	HQ UNFICYP	7	
	Infantry battalion, UNAB	393	
	Military police	<u>10</u>	410
Canada	HQ UNFICYP	8	
	HQ CANCON	17	
	Princess Patricia's Canadian		
	Light Infantry	526	
	Signal squadron	12	
	Military police	<u>12</u>	575

READEX
FICHE

/...

Denmark	HQ UNFICYP	6	
	Infantry battalion, DANCON 52	323	
	Military police	<u>13</u>	342
Finland	HQ UNFICYP	4	
	Military police	<u>3</u>	7
Ireland	HQ UNFICYP	6	
	Military police	<u>2</u>	8
Sweden	HQ UNFICYP	5	
	Military police	<u>3</u>	8
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	HQ UNFICYP	23	
	HQ BRITCON	6	
	Force Scout Car Squadron,		
	C Squadron, 9/12 Lancers	109	
	2nd Field Regt., Royal Artillery	320	
	Support Regiment (engineers, signals, army aviation flight, transport, medical centre, ordnance, workshops)	275	
	Military police	<u>9</u>	<u>742</u>
			<u>2 092</u>
<u>Civilian police</u>			
	Australia	21	
	Sweden	<u>18</u>	<u>39</u>
Total UNFICYP			<u>2 131</u>

4. At my request, Sweden increased its civilian police by three.

5. UNFICYP suffered two fatal casualties as a result of traffic accidents. This brings to 149 the total number of casualties since the inception of the Force in 1964.

6. Mr. Oscar Camili6n continued as my Special Representative in Cyprus. The Force remained under the command of Major General Clive Milner.

II. RELATIONS WITH THE PARTIES

7. UNFICYP maintained liaison and co-operation at all levels with the two sides in order to carry out its tasks effectively. The Force had freedom of movement in the southern part of the island, except for restricted military installations. Regarding movement in the northern part, the guidelines established in 1983 (see S/15812, para. 14) continued to be applied. As stated in my previous report

/...

(S/21010, para. 6), those guidelines were the subject of a review. Despite considerable effort, it has not yet been possible for UNFICYP to increase its freedom of movement in the northern part of the island. UNFICYP vehicles were occasionally delayed when crossing the United Nations buffer zone, and in a number of instances the forces on both sides challenged UNFICYP patrols that moved in parts of the buffer zone that are seldom visited. Such incidents were protested to the authorities concerned.

III. FUNCTIONS OF UNFICYP

A. Maintenance of the cease-fire and the status quo

8. The cease-fire lines extend approximately 180 kilometres from the Kokkina enclave and Kato Pyrgos on the north-west coast to the east coast south of Famagusta in the area of Dherinia. The area between the lines is known as the United Nations buffer zone. Its width varies from 20 metres to 7 kilometres, and it covers about 3 per cent of the island, including some of the most valuable agricultural land.

9. UNFICYP kept the buffer zone under constant surveillance through a system of 149 observation posts, 52 of which were permanently manned. Mobile and standing patrols were also employed, especially in sensitive areas. High-powered binoculars and night-vision devices were used to monitor the cease-fire lines on a continuous basis.

10. The UNFICYP patrol track has been gradually developed into a network, which covers the length of the buffer zone. It is essential to the ability of the Force to monitor the cease-fire lines, supervise farming in the buffer zone, re-supply observation posts and react promptly to incidents. British engineers made available to UNFICYP maintained the tracks in a workable condition.

11. During the period under review, UNFICYP initiated a mine-clearing project that will cover certain parts of the buffer zone where members of UNFICYP as well as civilians are at risk. The first step will be a detailed reconnaissance by experts that the Government of Canada has agreed to make available. The need for this work was highlighted on 3 April 1990, when an anti-tank mine exploded under a Ferret Scout Car on patrol in the buffer zone on a seldom-used road. Fortunately, the two crew members suffered only minor injuries.

12. During the period under review, the number of cease-fire violations remained at a very low level. The 1989 agreement concerning the unmanning of certain positions in Nicosia generally held, despite occasional increases in tension. UNFICYP pursued its efforts to extend the agreement to other positions in Nicosia.

13. There were 12 overflights of the United Nations buffer zone by Turkish forces aircraft and 2 by National Guard aircraft. In addition, there were two overflights from the north and six from the south by civilian aircraft. Further, there were five overflights by civilian or military aircraft of other countries.

14. At the end of February 1990, tension rose in the island, following the arrest by the Turkish Cypriot police of a young Greek Cypriot who had managed to cross the cease-fire lines undetected. The arrest was followed by a series of demonstrations, in which mostly students participated, on the Greek Cypriot side at the Ledra crossing point and in the vicinity of Paphos Gate in Nicosia. Subsequently, four more Greek Cypriots crossed the cease-fire lines and were arrested by the Turkish Cypriot authorities. Until the end of March, the Ledra crossing point was from time to time closed to traffic by the demonstrators. UNFICYP was never confronted by the demonstrators and its freedom of movement was not affected by the closure of the crossing point. The five arrested men were given gaol terms by the Turkish Cypriot authorities of 15 days, 20 days, 3 months, 4 months and 6 months respectively. UNFICYP was given access to them and arranged for them to communicate with their families and receive visits from them. As at 31 May 1990, two of the five remained in detention.

15. On 29 April 1990, two Greek Cypriot men on a motorcycle crossed the cease-fire lines at Nicosia, apparently by accident, and were arrested on the Turkish Cypriot side. They were released two days later; UNFICYP assisted in their return.

16. A serious incident directly involving UNFICYP occurred in the night of 23 May at an observation post at Athna, behind the Turkish Forces forward positions near the Sovereign Base Area of Dhekelia. Five men, armed with pistol and knives, overwhelmed the two United Nations soldiers manning the post, tied them up and took two rifles, ammunition, radios, telephones and personal equipment. The two soldiers suffered minor injuries. The authorities concerned are co-operating with UNFICYP in investigating the incident. The United Nations observation posts in the area were reinforced.

17. Both sides again expressed strong concern about the strength and development of the military forces on the other side. UNFICYP remained concerned about the level of forces in Cyprus and monitored them by overt means to the best of its ability.

B. Restoration of normal conditions and humanitarian functions

18. As part of its efforts to promote a return to normal conditions, UNFICYP facilitated economic and other civilian activities in the areas between and adjacent to the cease-fire lines. In particular, UNFICYP facilitated farming in the buffer zone.

19. UNFICYP used its good offices as necessary in regard to the supply of electricity and water from one part of the island to the other. Both sides co-operated in solving problems as they arose. The projects mentioned in the last report (S/21010, para. 19), the desilting of the Marathasa dam and the repair of the Lefka-Kafizes pipeline, were completed. UNFICYP also helped arrange the replacement of old water pipes in the buffer zone.

20. UNFICYP facilitated normal contacts between Greek and Turkish Cypriots by making available the facilities of the former Ledra Palace Hotel in the buffer zone in Nicosia. Various Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot organizations and groups, including the leaders of political parties from both sides, used these facilities to meet each other. Meetings and seminars were also organized there by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

21. The United Nations civilian police (UNCIVPOL) maintained close co-operation and liaison with the Cyprus and Turkish Cypriot police on matters having intercommunal aspects. In conjunction with the UNFICYP line units they contributed to the maintenance of law and order and assisted in investigations, control of civilians in the buffer zone and the Force's humanitarian activities.

22. The 1990 anti-mosquito programme arranged by UNFICYP commenced on 12 March 1990 with full co-operation from both sides. The programme is scheduled to end on 20 December 1990.

23. UNFICYP discharged its humanitarian functions for the Greek Cypriots living in the northern part of the island, almost all of them in the Karpass peninsula. They now number 593. UNFICYP delivered to them 403 tons of foodstuffs and other supplies provided by the Cyprus Government and the Cyprus Red Cross. It also delivered social welfare and pension benefits. UNFICYP personnel continued to interview, in private, Greek Cypriots who applied for permanent transfer to the southern part of the island, in order to verify that the transfer was voluntary. Five such transfers took place during the reporting period. UNFICYP also facilitated 608 visits by Greek Cypriots to the southern part of the island. The Greek Cypriot primary school in Rizokarpaso now has 26 pupils and the one in Ayia Trias has 10. UNFICYP again assisted in arranging visits of children attending school in the south to their families in the Karpass during holidays.

24. UNFICYP periodically visited Turkish Cypriots living in the southern part of the island. It helped them to maintain contact with their relatives in the northern part and arranged 22 family reunions involving 101 persons. UNFICYP also distributed pensions to Turkish Cypriots in the northern part of the island who were formerly employed by the Government of Cyprus.

25. The number of Maronites living in the northern part of the island is now 269. UNFICYP delivered to them 238 tons of foodstuffs and other supplies provided by the Cyprus Government and assisted in arranging frequent contacts between Maronites living on different sides of the cease-fire lines.

26. UNFICYP continued to provide emergency medical services, including medical evacuation, to members of both communities. It escorted Turkish Cypriots to hospitals in the southern part of the island and regularly delivered medicines to the Turkish Cypriot community. It also delivered mail and Red Cross messages across the cease-fire lines.

27. UNFICYP co-operated with UNHCR, as co-ordinator of United Nations humanitarian assistance to needy displaced persons in Cyprus, and UNDP, in particular to facilitate projects involving both communities. UNHCR supported such projects concerning sewage, medical care and rehabilitation of the handicapped. UNDP continued its activities in the framework of the Nicosia Master Plan and pursued projects with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) for the control of newborn animal diseases, with the International Labour Organisation (ILO) for the development of handicrafts and with the World Health Organization (WHO) for the prevention and control of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS).

IV. COMMITTEE ON MISSING PERSONS

28. During the period under review, the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus held four sessions comprising 25 meetings, of which 16 were attended by the three members and their assistants and 9 were attended by the three members. The Committee discussed reports submitted by both sides, and investigations were carried out in the field with the participation of the Third Member and/or his assistants. On 11 April 1990, the Committee issued a communiqué outlining its activities and the difficulties it faced in accomplishing its task. The communiqué is reproduced in the annex to the present report.

V. FINANCIAL ASPECTS

29. The cost to the United Nations of maintaining UNFICYP for a further period of six months beyond 15 June 1990, should the Security Council decide to extend the mandate of the Force and assuming continuation of its existing strength and responsibilities, is estimated at \$13.8 million, as detailed below:

UNFICYP cost estimates by major category of expense

(In thousands of United States dollars)

I. Operational costs incurred by the United Nations

Movement of contingents	290
Operational expenses	1 602
Premises (maintenance, utilities, etc.)	710
Rations	683
Non-military personnel, salaries, travel, etc.	2 965
Miscellaneous and contingencies	250
Total I	<u>6 500</u>

II. Reimbursement of extra costs of Governments providing contingents

Pay, allowances and transport	6 730
Contingent-owned equipment	470
Death and disability	100
Total II	<u>7 300</u>

Grand total (I and II) 13 800

/...

30. The estimate does not reflect the full cost of the operation. It excludes, in particular, the regular costs that would be incurred by the troop contributors if their contingents were serving at home (i.e., regular pay and allowances and normal expenses for matériel), as well as such extra costs as they have agreed to absorb.

31. That part of the financing of the cost of the Force that is borne by the Organization is dependent entirely on voluntary contributions from Governments. In this regard, only \$2.4 million have been contributed by Member States, against anticipated expenditures of some \$13.8 million for the mandate period that is about to end. As these contributions have never been sufficient to meet the cost of the Force, the reimbursement claims from the troop-contributing countries have been met only up to December 1980. Unless additional contributions are received, the accumulated deficit in the UNFICYP Special Account is expected to be \$179.3 million for the periods from the inception of the Force to the end of the current mandate period, 15 June 1990.

32. In a joint letter dated 7 May 1990, the Governments contributing troops to the Force expressed to me again their grave concern at the growing deficit in the UNFICYP Special Account (S/21294, annex). I have also taken note of their joint letter of 14 May 1990 to the President of the Security Council, in which they expressed the view that, in the absence of adequate voluntary contributions, there could be no alternative to the provision of funding through assessed contributions by all Member States (S/21301, annex). It may be recalled that some time ago I made a similar suggestion (S/18491, para. 65).

VI. GOOD OFFICES OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

33. I have informed the Security Council about developments relating to my mission of good offices, particularly in my report of 8 March 1990 (S/21183). On 12 March 1990, the Council adopted resolution 649 (1990). In that resolution, the Council requested me, among other things, to inform it in the present report of the progress made in resuming the intensive talks and in developing an agreed outline of an overall agreement in line with its resolution. Since then, I have pursued my efforts and in May, in the absence of Mr. Camilión who was away from the island for compelling personal reasons, Mr. Gustave Feissel, Director in my offices, spent several weeks in Cyprus to hold, on my behalf, consultations with the two sides concerning the implementation of resolution 649 (1990). Those contacts have not yet been concluded. I intend to submit to the Council a further report and related observations, as soon as this has happened.

VII. OBSERVATIONS

34. During the last six months, UNFICYP continued to perform its important functions of supervising the cease-fire, maintaining calm and promoting peaceful civilian activity in the area between the cease-fire lines. In carrying out its tasks, the Force had the co-operation of both sides.

35. In the light of the prevailing circumstances, I have concluded that the continued presence of the Force in the island remains indispensable to achieve the objectives set by the Security Council. I therefore recommend to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further six-month period. In accordance with established practice, I have undertaken consultations on this matter with the parties concerned, and I shall report to the Council on these consultations as soon as they have been completed.

36. In making this recommendation, I have to underline that UNFICYP is facing a chronic and ever-deepening financial crisis, which imposes an inordinately heavy burden on the countries contributing troops to the Force. I fully share their Governments' concern at this situation. An important step towards alleviating it would be for the United Nations part of the cost of the Force to be financed from assessed contributions. I hope that the Security Council will come to accept this measure.

37. I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the Governments contributing troops and civilian police to UNFICYP for the steadfast support they have continued to give this important peace-keeping operation of the United Nations. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Governments that have contributed towards the financing of the Force.

38. In concluding, I wish to pay tribute to my Special Representative, Mr. Oscar Camilión, to the Force Commander, Major General Clive Milner, and to the military and civilian personnel of UNFICYP who have continued to discharge with efficiency and dedication the important and difficult responsibilities entrusted to them by the Security Council.

Annex

Press communiqué issued by the Committee on Missing Persons
in Cyprus on 11 April 1990

1. In its communiqué of 25 October 1989, the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus alluded to some of the difficulties it was facing. It has been brought to the attention of the Committee that there is still little public knowledge of the realities of its activities and of the nature of the difficulties it is facing. The Committee on Missing Persons is bound by rules of discretion and confidentiality. As a result, it may not have been sufficiently explicit in its public announcements. At this stage, it is felt that there is scope for more information on the nature of its work and difficulties it encounters.
2. The Committee on Missing Persons was set up in 1981, under the auspices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, after agreement between the two sides, in order to investigate the cases of missing persons, both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot. It comprises three members, one representative from each side and a Third Member appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
3. The Committee underlines here that it is a purely humanitarian organ; it has no police or judicial powers. Indeed, such powers would be in total contradiction to its basic humanitarian nature, as it is concerned with obtaining information and not with attributing responsibility for the disappearances.
4. As the Committee has already said in the past, its activity is entirely based on two factors:
 - (a) The files and documents submitted to it by each side on the missing persons of that side;
 - (b) The testimony of the witnesses, both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot, interviewed by the investigative teams.
5. In practice, the investigative teams are organized by, and under the entire responsibility of, the Greek Cypriot or Turkish Cypriot side, as the case may be. The Third Member and/or his assistant(s) participate in the interviews, put the questions they want, as well as making any visits in the field which the investigations may require. The Third Member and his assistants have never experienced any difficulties as regards the interviews or the visits in the field, while accompanying the investigative teams on both sides. These investigative teams are responsible for locating witnesses, arranging interviews and translating statements.
6. The real, central difficulty the Committee is confronted with is that the witnesses are often reluctant, unwilling or unable to give full information in their knowledge on the disappearance of a missing person. The co-operation of the witnesses is absolutely fundamental for the Committee. The Committee, it must be added, cannot compel a witness to talk. Therefore, when witnesses are reluctant to

/...

give complete and precise evidence, the Committee is faced with a serious problem, because it may not then have at its disposal all the information it needs. Although the members can have different views as to the quality of the information necessary to draw conclusions, there is agreement in the Committee that the fullest information must be sought.

7. One of the reasons for the reluctance of the witnesses, regrettable as this reluctance is, can be explained, in certain circumstances, where the witness is afraid of incriminating himself or incriminating others in disappearances.

8. The Committee and its investigative teams repeatedly tell all witnesses that information given to the Committee and to the teams will be kept strictly confidential and that they, the witnesses, will not be subject to any form of police or judicial prosecution. This policy was decided in order to reassure the witnesses as far as possible but, unfortunately, the outcome so far has not yet yielded the expected results.

9. In this connection, the Committee solemnly appeals to both sides to pursue, with renewed vigour, their assistance to the Committee so that it can accomplish its humanitarian mandate in the best conditions. A significant contribution in this respect is to encourage generally all witnesses interviewed by the Committee, in the framework of its procedures, to give the very fullest information in their knowledge.

10. In order further to allay the fears of the witnesses, the Committee, so as to give the strongest guarantees to the witnesses, is examining measures that could be taken to ensure that they would be immune from possible judicial and/or police proceedings solely in connection with the issue of missing persons and for any statement, written or oral, made for the Committee in the pursuit of activities within its mandate.

11. A further element complicates the work of the Committee: the mere passage of time (the disappearance of missing persons 15 or even 25 years ago). Some witnesses are now too old to remember precisely the events surrounding the disappearances; others have left the country in the mean time, or are dead.

It must be recalled in this respect that the Committee's mandate is to investigate cases of missing persons, Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot, reported missing in, as stated in the terms of reference, the intercommunal fightings as well as in the events of 1974 and afterwards.

It must also be added that the disappearances in 1963/64 and in 1974 occurred during troubled periods.

12. The Committee feels obliged to repeat here that, in order to fulfil its mandate, and to take decisions about the fate of a missing person, the Committee must act by consensus, that is, by unanimous agreement amongst the three members.

/...

13. The Committee is fully aware of the anguish and anxiety of the families, both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot. It would obviously be most desirous of finding ways and means to relieve their uncertainties. This is indeed a matter of serious concern to the Committee.

14. It is the duty of the Committee to use its best efforts to try to compile lists of missing persons of both communities, specifying, as appropriate, whether they are alive or dead, and in the latter case the approximate time of the deaths.

The Committee will not attempt to attribute responsibility for the deaths of any missing persons or make findings as to the cause of such deaths.

The most conclusive proof of the death of a missing person would, of course, be identifiable remains, and the desire of the families to obtain the remains of the missing one is a humanitarian and legitimate one, notably also for religious reasons. The investigative teams have for that reason also inquired systematically on both sides on burial places of missing persons, both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot. However, on neither side has the Committee been successful in this respect. No disinterment can take place under the aegis of the Committee, except that, should the Committee decide it, the matter would be referred to the International Committee of the Red Cross for processing according to its customary procedure.

15. The Committee is free to access all the evidence available and is not restricted to any one particular type of evidence. It is also clear, however, that to reach conclusions about the fate of missing persons on the evidence submitted, the Committee must have a common appreciation of the value of this evidence. The Committee has not been able as yet to reach that stage; it is pursuing its efforts to find an indispensable common denominator.

16. The Committee is now considering the possibility of requesting that the two sides furnish it with basic information concerning the files of all missing persons. The Committee will thus have a global view of the whole problem and also hope thereby to get relevant information and additional evidence which would help it to conclude those cases in hand which it has been unable to finalize up to now.

17. In conclusion, it is under these various objective difficulties that the Committee has to accomplish its humanitarian task. The Committee will do everything to pursue vigorously all the necessary investigations to obtain the fullest possible information on the basis of which to determine the fate of the missing persons, both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot, and communicate the results of its investigations to both sides, to the families concerned, as early as possible.

2

2

MP Det

ДИСЛОКАЦИЯ ВСООНК НА МАИ 1990

332

Coarse-Fine Lines of
Folklore, Fantasy

Lignes du Centre et des forces torquantes

والله اعلم بالصواب

Operational



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/21340/Add.1
13 June 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS
OPERATION IN CYPRUS

(For the period 1 December 1989-31 May 1990)

Addendum

In my report of 31 May 1990 (S/21340, para. 35), I recommended that the Security Council extend the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a further period of six months, and I indicated that I would report to the Council on my consultations with the parties concerned on the matter. I wish to inform the Council that the Government of Cyprus as well as the Governments of Greece and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have indicated their concurrence with the proposed extension. The Government of Turkey has indicated that it concurs with and supports the position of the Turkish Cypriot side, which is that the text of the draft resolution contained in document S/21357 is unacceptable as a basis for extending the stationing of UNFICYP, but that its stand will be expounded at the meeting of the Security Council.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERALS/21341
4 June 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER GROUP IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Report of the Secretary-General

1. The present report is submitted to the Security Council in accordance with the request contained in the statement made by the President at the Council's 2922nd meeting on 23 May 1990 (S/21331). It is based on reports received from the Chief Military Observer of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) and from my Alternate Personal Representative for Central America who, on my instructions, have continued to observe closely on the ground all developments in Nicaragua relevant to the tasks entrusted to ONUCA by the Security Council.
2. On 25 May 1990 I received from the Chief Military Observer a list of complaints which had earlier been presented to ONUCA by the leadership of the Nicaraguan resistance alleging violations of the Managua Agreements of 18 April (S/21272) by the Nicaraguan army. Most of these complaints related to the continuing presence of armed civilians and militia personnel in security zones 2 and 5 and in the demilitarized zones surrounding security zones 1, 2 and 5. But they also referred to the alleged presence of units of the Nicaraguan army at eight locations in the demilitarized zone surrounding security zone 1. ONUCA had also received complaints from the Nicaraguan Government about the presence outside the security zones of armed members of the Nicaraguan resistance who had allegedly stolen cattle and committed other criminal acts.
3. On my express instructions, the Chief Military Observer took urgent action during the following days to investigate all the complaints received. By 30 May almost all of them had been resolved by ONUCA through negotiation at the highest level with the Nicaraguan authorities on the one hand and the Nicaraguan resistance on the other. The few complaints which remain unresolved arise mostly from cases where there is a difference of opinion between the two sides about the precise boundaries of the security zones and the demilitarized zones.
4. In general, it remains my assessment that there have been no serious violations of the cease-fire. There have been some breaches of the agreement on the separation of forces in certain areas. Many of these are, in the Chief Military Observer's view, attributable to lack of trust between the two sides, following eight years of hostilities. Almost all of them have been quickly resolved after being raised by ONUCA with the parties concerned.

5. However, implementation of the Managua Agreements encountered a setback on 25 May when the leadership of the Nicaraguan resistance issued a statement in which it alleged that the Nicaraguan authorities had failed to carry out their commitments under the Agreements and complained about an alleged attack carried out one week before by Nicaraguan army troops against a large number of demobilized members of the resistance and their families, in which many were said to have been killed or injured. In these circumstances, the leadership of the resistance declared that it had decided to suspend indefinitely the demobilization process.

6. The following day, 26 May, a joint investigation commission consisting of representatives of the Nicaraguan Government, the Nicaraguan resistance, the Archbishop of Managua, ONUCA and the International Support and Verification Commission (CIAV) was set up by the Government to investigate the alleged massacre. On 2 June the Chief Military Observer reported to me that in its final report issued on 30 May the Joint Commission had in effect concluded that there was no evidence to support the allegation that a massacre had taken place.

7. On the night of 29/30 May an important meeting took place between President Chamorro of Nicaragua, "Commander Franklyn" of the Nicaraguan resistance and the Archbishop of Managua, Cardinal Obando y Bravo, with the Chief Military Observer of ONUCA and representatives of CIAV being present as observers. The meeting resulted in an agreement entitled the "Managua Protocol", the text of which is attached as an annex to the present report. Under the terms of the Managua Protocol, the Nicaraguan Government responded to a number of the resistance's publicly stated concerns, notably through the establishment of "development areas" (polos de desarrollo) in which demobilized members of the resistance would be resettled; economic assistance to former members of the resistance; the creation of a police force for the development areas in which former members of the resistance would participate; various security measures; and full implementation of the Managua Agreements. For its part, the resistance reaffirmed its commitment to demobilize by 10 June 1990 at the latest and, to this end, undertook that at least 100 combatants would be demobilized each day in each of the security zones.

8. It will be noted that paragraph 5 (a) of the Managua Protocol refers to an enlargement of the mandate of ONUCA. I have not as yet received any communication in this respect from the Government of Nicaragua. However, I have been informed by the Chief Military Observer that at the meeting on 29/30 May the representatives of the Nicaraguan resistance proposed that ONUCA should be given the additional tasks of collecting weapons that might remain in civilian hands in Nicaragua, training a new national police force and verifying the proposed reduction in the strength of the Nicaraguan army. I have, of course, instructed the Chief Military Observer to make clear to all concerned that any matter having to do with ONUCA's mandate will fall within the responsibility of the Security Council, which would have to approve any modification or further enlargement of the mandate. I have also instructed him to indicate that the members of the Council alone could decide whether or not ONUCA should be involved in such tasks and that they have already expressed their concern at the delay in implementing existing agreements on whose basis they have twice enlarged ONUCA's mandate.

9. On the day the Managua Protocol was signed, 30 May, there was a marked increase in the pace of demobilization, with 498 members of the Nicaraguan resistance being demobilized. In the five days since the Protocol was signed, namely 30 May to 3 June inclusive, the number demobilized in zones 1 to 5 has averaged 377 daily, bringing to 3,726 the total demobilized in those zones since the process began on 8 May. ONUCA's estimate, as of 3 June, is that approximately 9,800 members of the Nicaraguan resistance covered by the Managua Protocol remain to be demobilized. This total excludes the members of the Atlantic Front of the Nicaraguan resistance (YATAMA), whose demobilization, which is covered under a separate agreement, started on 21 May. So far 187 members of YATAMA have been demobilized. In addition, it should be noted that a branch of the Nicaraguan resistance known as the Southern Front (Frente Sur), which claims to have as many as 2,000 combatants under arms outside the security zones, has so far failed to sign an agreement to demobilize. Negotiations in Managua between Government representatives and leaders of the Southern Front broke down on 22 May and have not as yet been resumed.

10. On 29 and 30 May my Alternate Personal Representative met in Mexico City with the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) and, on my behalf, conveyed to him the Security Council's concerns, in accordance with the request contained in the President's statement of 23 May. Mr. Baena Soares stressed that he fully shared the Security Council's point of view and would convey his concerns to the forthcoming meeting of the OAS Assembly in Asunción. It was agreed that closely co-ordinated steps would need to be taken by the United Nations and OAS in the event that the various agreements relating to the demobilization of the members of the Nicaraguan resistance were not implemented.

Observations

11. It will be clear from the figures in paragraph 9 above that while there has been a welcome increase in the rate of demobilization since the Managua Protocol was signed, the leaders of the Nicaraguan resistance have still not achieved the minimum target to which they committed themselves in that document. If there is no improvement in the current rate of demobilization, less than half the members of the Nicaraguan resistance covered by the Managua Protocol will have been demobilized by 10 June and large numbers of them will remain under arms in the security zones. I have accordingly instructed the Chief Military Observer and my Alternate Personal Representative to do all in their power to persuade those concerned to increase substantially the pace of demobilization. It is necessary for the Nicaraguan resistance to demonstrate convincingly not only that an irreversible process is under way but also that it is not raising obstacles of any kind and is doing everything possible to facilitate the completion of demobilization by the agreed date of 10 June.

12. In paragraph 4 of its resolution 654 (1990) the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council not later than 10 June concerning the completion of the demobilization process. It is accordingly my intention to present a further report to the Council by next Sunday, 10 June. If by that date demobilization has not been very largely completed, the Council will need to consider the decisions it should take in order to deal with the dilemma to which I referred in my statement at its informal consultations on 22 May.

/...

Annex

[Original: Spanish]

Managua protocol on disarmament

In the spirit of the Managua Declaration signed on 4 May 1990, the resistance, the Government of Nicaragua and His Eminence Miguel Cardinal Obando y Bravo have by these presents agreed as follows:

1. The implementation of measures planned in connection with the "Commitment to guarantee the physical and moral integrity of the combatants of the Nicaraguan resistance, as a group and individually, their family members and the civilian population accompanying them" shall be facilitated as follows:

(a) The seriously ill shall be moved immediately so that they may receive the necessary medical care in a Nicaraguan hospital;

(b) Disabled and wounded ex-combatants shall be given specialized care in Managua;

(c) A commission comprising members from the Government, the Nicaraguan resistance, the United Nations International Support and Verification Commission (CIAV) and His Eminence Miguel Cardinal Obando y Bravo shall be established to travel to Honduras and Costa Rica in order to make a thorough investigation of the living conditions of the families of the resistance combatants and take emergency measures to solve any problems that come to light;

(d) The resistance is urged to submit immediately a list of widows and orphans, so that the Nicaraguan Social Security and Welfare Institute can include them in its budget and they can receive the monthly pensions to which they are entitled.

2. By agreement among the parties, the development area known as "El Almendro", described in the annexed document on the development areas, shall be established on the basis of the proposal made by the Government. The series of steps required for its implementation and for the settlement of the demobilized combatants in the development areas shall begin as from today's date.

3. The Government of Nicaragua undertakes to provide each demobilized combatant with minimal economic assistance.

4. It undertakes to set up immediately a police force for internal order, in which former members of the resistance will participate, the main object of which shall be to safeguard the life and physical integrity of the citizens living in the development areas. It is also proposed that this police force should come under the organizational structure of the Ministry of the Interior. In addition, the United Nations or a friendly country shall be asked to provide technical advice on the professional training of the police force.

/...

5. It undertakes to create the proper security conditions in the demilitarized areas, to which end it is considered necessary to:

(a) Make arrangements to have the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) enlarged;

(b) Have the Government provide supplementary assistance to each demobilized combatant leaving a security zone;

(c) Demilitarize each area of conflict;

(d) Continue collecting weapons in the hands of civilians in the areas of conflict.

6. It undertakes to guarantee the safety of ex-combatants who agree to demobilize and leave the security zones, settling in the development areas. The option of returning to their place of origin shall also be available for those who wish to do so. It is understood that anyone so opting shall, like any other citizen, assume the risks involved.

7. The Government undertakes to appoint upon the recommendation of the resistance, a representative of the demobilized combatants to the Ministries dealing with ex-combatants and their families, namely the Ministries of Health, Agrarian Reform, Labour and others, and also to appoint two members to the Governing Council of the Nicaraguan Repatriation Institute.

8. The Government of Nicaragua undertakes to allow the ex-combatants of the resistance who have settled in the development areas to participate in the local government, that is, within the development area. In addition, the ex-combatants who return to their places of origin shall receive the necessary support from State agencies for their integration into civilian life.

9. The Managua Declaration is hereby ratified in each and every point, with particular emphasis on the provisions in respect of the possibility that the resistance may become a political party, thus allowing its full integration into the political life of the country.

10. In compliance with the Toncontin Agreement and its addendum, the resistance hereby ratifies its undertaking to demobilize and lay down its arms by 10 June 1990 at the latest. To that end, the resistance undertakes to demobilize at least 100 combatants each day in each zone as from this date. Furthermore, in honour of Mother's Day, a considerable number of the combatants of the Nicaraguan resistance shall be demobilized.

S/21341
English
Page 6

DONE at Managua on 30 May 1990.

(Signed) Violeta BARRIOS de CHAMORRO
President of the Republic

(Signed) Israel GALEANO
Commander Franklin

(Signed) Miguel OBANDO y BRAVO
Cardinal of Nicaragua



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/44/953
S/21342
4 June 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-fourth session
Agenda item 47
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-fifth year

Letter dated 1 June 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey
to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the intervention made by my delegation at the debate in the Second (Social) Committee of the Economic and Social Council, on 17 May 1990, in connection with agenda item 3 (Human rights questions). In that intervention, my delegation alluded to the statement made by the representative of the Greek Cypriots and declared that the representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus might wish to reply to that statement.

I am now in receipt of such a reply from His Excellency Mr. Özer Koray, the representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex), and I shall be grateful if you would kindly have it circulated as a document of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 47, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mustafa AKSIN
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX

Letter dated 1 June 1990 from Mr. Özer Koray to the
Secretary-General

I am under instructions from my government to reply to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot representative at the Second (Social) Committee of the Economic and Social Council, under agenda item 3, in order to set the record straight.

During the deliberations of the Committee, as in all the other international forums where the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is not represented, the Greek Cypriot side, under the usurped title of a long-defunct "Government of Cyprus", has repeated its baseless allegations and distortions in relation to the human rights situation in Cyprus. The misrepresentation on the part of the Greek Cypriot representative and his unfounded accusations against the Turkish Cypriot side cannot conceal the criminal record of the Greek Cypriot administration between 1963-1974. No pious statements can exonerate the Greek Cypriot leadership from the grave responsibility for the murder of hundreds of defenseless Turkish Cypriots, the uprooting of thousands from their homes, and for the destruction of the bi-communal partnership state by force of arms in the name of Enosis (union of Cyprus with Greece).

In December of 1963, the Greek Cypriots mobilized their forces to implement an insidious plan, known as the Akritas plan, for the total extermination of the Turkish Cypriot population in the island. Turkish Cypriots were hunted down in their own land, abducted from roads and even from hospital beds, never to be seen again. Turkish Cypriot villages were raided and burnt down; in some villages, whole populations were massacred and bulldozed into mass graves. As a result, the Turkish Cypriot people were pushed into enclaves where they had to live under a "veritable siege", as described by the then United Nations Secretary-General in his report of 10 September 1964 (S/5950) submitted to the Security Council. Between 1963 and 1974, the Greek Cypriot side, in its ruthless attempt to unite Cyprus with Greece, violated every human right of the Turkish Cypriot people.

The historical record in Cyprus is replete with examples of crimes and atrocities committed by the Greek Cypriot administration during 1963-1974. The grievous suffering inflicted upon the Turkish Cypriot people is well-documented in the reports of the Secretaries-General of that period and needs no further elaboration.

Oppression and discrimination against the Turkish Cypriots continued until July 1974 when the Greek Cypriots, in collaboration with the Greek Government, staged a coup d'état in Cyprus in order to formalize the annexation of the island to Greece. Thousands of Cypriots, both Greek and Turkish, died during the turbulence that followed the coup. The imminent danger posed against the Turkish Cypriot people became intolerable and the Turkish Government was compelled to intervene in Cyprus to protect the lives of the Turkish Cypriots. This military intervention was carried out in accordance with article 4 of the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960. The Greek Cypriot representative's attempts to describe this justified intervention as an "invasion" or "occupation" has no bearing with reality.

/...

Turkey's intervention in Cyprus saved the Turkish Cypriots from annihilation; brought to an end a decade of systematic human rights violations by the Greek Cypriots; and eliminated a most serious source of tension and instability in the Eastern Mediterranean. It also preserved the independence of Cyprus by preventing the annexation of the island by Greece. It was not an "invasion", but a peace operation which provided the Turkish Cypriots with security of life and brought peace and tranquillity to the island. One further by-product of this intervention was the restoration of democracy in Greece.

After an agreement for the voluntary exchange of populations was concluded between the two sides at Vienna, on 2 August 1975, the Turkish Cypriot people moved to the north of the island for security reasons and the Greek Cypriots moved to the south. This agreement was implemented under the auspices and supervision of the United Nations. The transfer of populations was carried out on a voluntary basis. There was no forcible displacement of populations as alleged by the Greek Cypriot side. Consequently, the question of "refugees", as referred to by the Greek Cypriot representative, is a non-issue being exploited by the Greek Cypriots to deceive those who are not familiar with the recent history of Cyprus.

In this connection, I should also like to make it clear that the Greek Cypriots who have chosen to stay in the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus after 1974 enjoy every freedom and human right, and can move freely to the south or any other place of their choice. Contrary to the allegations of the Greek Cypriot representative we have no "enclaved persons" in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The periodic reports of the Secretary-General reveal that any movement of Greek Cypriots to the south is according to the free-will of the individual. United Nations reports, as well as other sources, prove that the Greek Cypriots living in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus enjoy every basic human right.

The Greek Cypriot representative has also raised the phony issue of "settlers from Turkey". I will briefly restate the facts in this regard. To begin with, the allegation that the "influx of settlers" is a move taken to alter the demographic structure of the island is groundless.

Time and again we have stated that our immigration policies, as well as the entry and exit procedures of tourists, are questions within the exclusive competence and jurisdiction of the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. It is natural that, like other countries, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus should regulate labour entry and exit in accordance with its economic requirements.

The Greek Cypriots are the last people to complain about "changing the demographic structure of the island", since they have been the initiators of such policies for the purpose of "Hellenizing" the island. We have not forgotten how, when the Turkish Cypriots were forced to live in enclaves before 1974, with severe restrictions on their freedom of movement, every encouragement was given by the Greek Cypriot administration for Turkish Cypriots to leave the island. Once they had left, these Turkish Cypriots were prevented from returning to their native land. Paragraph 108 of the Secretary-General's report of 13 June 1967 (S/7969)

/...

states as follows: "No obstacles are placed by the Government in the way of Turkish Cypriots wishing to leave the island, but there is a standing ban on the return of Turkish Cypriot students from Turkey ..." In the same paragraph, it is stated that: "Any young Turkish Cypriots who go to Turkey must therefore resign themselves to an indefinite period of separation from their homeland". By these cruel methods, the Greek Cypriots carried out their plans to change the demographic structure of the island under the smoke screen of "security considerations".

The Greek Cypriot representative also raised the issue of missing persons. This particular issue, which is exclusively of a humanitarian nature, is being cynically kept alive by the Greek Cypriot side for political propaganda purposes. Rather than allowing the Missing Persons Committee to pursue its designated humanitarian functions in conformity with the agreed terms of reference, the Greek Cypriot side prefers, even at the cost of causing anguish to its own people, the callous exploitation of the issue. It also tries to present it to the world community as an entirely Greek Cypriot problem, whereas the problem of missing persons has been tormenting the Turkish Cypriot people ever since the island-wide carnage by Greek Cypriot armed elements began in December 1963.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that the Greek Cypriot side is in no position to lecture anybody on human rights issues. It is hypocritical for the representative of the Greek Cypriot administration, while crying to pass his illegal administration off as the only legitimate entity capable of representing the island as a whole, to spare no effort to undermine the legitimate rights and freedoms of the Turkish Cypriot people, in gross distortion of the historical and current realities in Cyprus. There is, of course, no mention of the fact that it was his administration that trampled upon the most basic human rights of the Turkish Cypriots. It was the Greek Cypriots who violated the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the rule of international law, by waging a ruthless war of attrition and terrorism against the Turkish Cypriot people.

Since 1974, the Turkish Cypriot people have been enjoying human rights free from Greek Cypriot domination. They have established their own state under a democratically elected government. All sovereignty and authority rests with the Parliament of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, representing the free-will of the Turkish Cypriot people.

The recent elections in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus have confirmed the determination and will of the Turkish Cypriot people to stay free, to uphold the principles of democracy, to preserve their national identity and to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their homeland, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The Greek Cypriot side must come to terms with this reality and learn to respect the legitimate rights of the Turkish Cypriots, in compliance with Security Council resolution 649 (1990).



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/21343
5 June 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

NOTE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The attached letter, dated 4 June 1990, was addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Permanent Observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations. In accordance with the request contained in the letter, the text is being circulated as a document of the Security Council.

Annex

Letter dated 4 June 1990 from the Permanent Observer of the
Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations
addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to forward to you the disarmament proposal for peace on the Korean peninsula adopted at the Joint Meeting of the Central People's Committee, the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly and the Administration Council of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 31 May 1990.

I request that this letter, together with the enclosed disarmament proposal for peace on the Korean peninsula, be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) PAK Gil Yon
Ambassador
Permanent Observer

Enclosure

On easing the tensions on the Korean Peninsula and creating a
peaceful climate for national reunification

(Disarmament proposal for peace on the Korean peninsula,
made at Pyongyang, on 31 May 1990)

Never in the past 40 odd years has the Korean nation been freed from the danger of war or enjoyed peace in the true sense of the word. Although confrontation and disputes are disappearing in other parts of the world, the tensions on the Korean peninsula are growing more acute daily.

For too long the Korean nation in the north and the south has lived in an unstable situation little different from a war-time state, wasting the precious wealth of the country on confrontation. Confrontation and war are not beneficial either to the north or to the south.

The north and the south must no longer overlook the confrontation and the danger of war which are now on an increase daily or hesitate to remove the great danger of nuclear war that has faced the nation for dozens of years and to open a phase of turning towards peace.

Peace on the Korean peninsula will be presented by no one and will never be achieved with empty words. The Korean nation should achieve peace in the country by its own efforts, prevent Korea from becoming a land of scrambles of outside forces or a theatre of horrible nuclear war and let all fellow countrymen live in peace and harmony in an independent, unified Korea, even if the world may be plunged into turmoil.

In order to ease the tensions on the Korean peninsula and create a peaceful climate for national reunification, it is of primary importance, at present, to adopt a non-aggression declaration between the north and the south.

In the non-aggression declaration, the north and the south should promise each other not to invade the other side by force of arms and, at the same time, should envisage a substantial guarantee for it. The key to the substantial guarantee for the non-aggression declaration and the preservation of peace is to reduce the armed forces of the north and the south drastically.

Without disarmament it is impossible to build confidence between the north and the south, bring the dialogue for reunification to a success, realize co-operation and exchange or achieve the peaceful reunification of the country. The north and the south should no longer pursue confrontation and an arms race which give rise to mutual misunderstanding and distrust and hinder peaceful reunification and should carry out drastic phased arms reduction in conformity with the desire of the fellow countrymen and the international trend.

A joint meeting of the Central People's Committee, the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly and the Administration Council of the Democratic

/...

People's Republic of Korea declares the following new disarmament proposal, putting in a more concrete shape the peace package proposed in November 1988 to suit the practical conditions:

A. Confidence-building between the north and the south

1. The north and the south should limit military training and military manoeuvres:

(a) Any joint military manoeuvres and military training with foreign troops should be banned;

(b) Military training and military manoeuvres of the divisional level and above should be banned;

(c) All military manoeuvres should be banned in the area along the military demarcation line (MDL);

(d) Military manoeuvres of foreign troops should not be allowed in the territory of the north or the south;

(e) The north and the south should notify each other in advance of military manoeuvres.

2. The north and the south should convert the demilitarized zone (DMZ) along the MDL into a peace zone:

(a) All military personnel and military equipment should be withdrawn from the DMZ;

(b) All the military set-ups in the DMZ should be dismantled;

(c) The DMZ should be opened to civilians and be used for peaceful purposes.

3. The north and the south should take security measures to prevent an accidental conflict and its expansion:

(a) Direct telephone links should be installed and operated between the high-level military authorities of the two sides;

(b) All acts of military provocation against the other side should be banned in the area along the MDL.

B. Arms reduction in the north and the south

4. The north and the south should reduce their armed forces stage by stage:

(a) The reduction of military strength should be carried out in three phases in a period of three or four years after a disarmament agreement is reached between the two sides. Each side should reduce its military strength to the 300,000-men level in the first stage, to the 200,000-men level in the second stage and to the level of less than 100,000 men in the third stage;

(b) Military equipment should be reduced or dismantled in proportion to the phased military reduction;

(c) All the civilian military organizations and civilian armed forces should be dissolved in the first stage of the reduction of the regular armed forces.

5. The north and the south should stop the qualitative improvement of military equipment:

(a) The introduction of new military technology and equipment and the development of military equipment should be stopped;

(b) New military technology and equipment should not be introduced from foreign countries.

6. The north and the south should inform each other of the process of disarmament and verify it:

(a) Both sides should inform each other of the process of arms reduction;

(b) The implementation of the disarmament agreement should be verified through mutual spot inspections of the other side's area.

C. Withdrawal of foreign forces

7. The north and the south should convert the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone:

(a) Joint efforts should be made to get all the nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea withdrawn immediately;

(b) Nuclear weapons should not be produced or purchased;

(c) Foreign planes and warships loaded with nuclear weapons should be banned from entering or passing through Korea.

8. The north and the south should make joint efforts to get all foreign troops withdrawn from the Korean peninsula:

/...

(a) Steps should be taken to make the United States troops and their equipment present in south Korea withdraw totally on a phased basis in keeping with the arms reduction of the north and the south;

(b) Steps should be taken to have the United States military bases in south Korea dismantled on a phased basis in keeping with the pull-out of the United States troops.

D. Disarmament and guarantee for peace after it

9. The north and the south should take measures for disarmament and guarantee of peace after it:

(a) A Neutral Nations Inspection Force might be deployed in the DMZ along the MDL;

(b) A North-South Joint Military Committee headed by a person at the level of the Chief of General Staff from each side should be formed and operated to control armaments and discuss and settle possible military disputes between the north and the south.

10. The north and the south should adopt a non-aggression declaration through negotiation and reach an agreement on drastic arms reduction.

For a complete and durable peace on the Korean peninsula, the present state of armistice must be converted into a state of peace.

The United States must come to Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States talks or tripartite talks for the signing of a peace agreement, being the party chiefly responsible for the guarantee of peace on the Korean peninsula.



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/45/304
S/21344
6 June 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-fifth session
Item 34 of the preliminary list*
POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE
GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-fifth year

Letter dated 5 June 1990 from the Permanent Representative
of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the
Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit the attached statements made by His Excellency Dr. Quett K. J. Masire, President of the Republic of Botswana, and Mr. Nelson Mandela, Deputy President of the African National Congress, on the occasion of the latter's visit to Botswana.

I would be grateful if the present letter and these statements could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under item 34 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Legwaila J. LEGWAILA
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative

* A/45/50.

90-14231 1700b (E)

/...

ANNEX I

Welcome remarks dated 4 June 1990 by the President of the Republic of Botswana on the occasion of the visit to Botswana of the Vice-President of the African National Congress

1. It is a great pleasure for me, on behalf of the Government and the people of Botswana, and on my own behalf, to extend a very warm welcome to the Vice-President of the African National Congress, Mr. Nelson Mandela, to Mrs. Winnie Mandela and to all the members of his delegation. We are most grateful, indeed, that despite his preoccupation with the political developments in his own country, as well as the heavy demands that are being made continuously on his precious time, he still found it possible to accept our invitation to visit the Republic of Botswana. I would like to assure Mr. Mandela that we regard his visit to our country not only as an honour to its people, but also as a clear indication of his appreciation of Botswana's unflinching commitment to the cause of liberation in southern Africa and to the attainment of a non-racial democratic society in South Africa.
2. Nelson Mandela is a hero of our time, a great man who has fought tirelessly for the eradication of apartheid for most of his life. He is a passionate democrat who has no truck with discrimination of any kind. Spending 27 years in gaol has not in any way shaken his commitment to the liberation struggle in South Africa. In fact, on the contrary, the long years of incarceration have strengthened and deepened his resolve to bring about an end to apartheid and to usher in a democratic South Africa. There is no sign of bitterness in his heart, no sign of rancour despite his long and unjustifiable term of imprisonment. His release, which was celebrated world-wide, was the result of a combination of a bitter struggle waged over a period of many years by the ANC and the people of South Africa, on the one hand, and of relentless pressure exerted by the international community, on the other.
3. True to his character and conviction, Mr. Mandela fought tirelessly against apartheid even inside the prison cells of Robben Island through Pollsmoor to Victor Verster. He never compromised his principles and his convictions. In a word, he has dedicated his life to the freedom of his people and the establishment of a non-racial and democratic South Africa. Mr. Mandela, we join the world in saluting your courage and patience in fighting for what is right and just.
4. Botswana have always condemned and rejected the apartheid system practised in South Africa because it is immoral and evil. That is why we have supported and continue to support the demands of the oppressed majority for a non-racial and democratic society. That is one of the reasons why we are a front-line State.
5. The accession to power of President de Klerk, the measures that his Government announced on 2 February and the subsequent release of Mr. Mandela and other political prisoners, give us reason to hope that there may be some light at the end of the tunnel. Even more encouraging were the results of the recent talks about talks held between the African National Congress and the South African Government.

The road ahead is, of course, a difficult, tortuous and bumpy one, but we have confidence in your ability and the determination of the people of South Africa to weather it all.

6. The front-line States stand ready to assist in whatever way they can, during the difficult transition from apartheid to a democratic South Africa. The people of South Africa have suffered for too long; they deserve peace and dignity in their motherland. The remaining obstacles to negotiations must therefore be removed without delay. It is the duty of the international community to ensure complete implementation of the Declaration of the Sixteenth Special Session of the General Assembly, which was inspired by the Harare Declaration.

7. Nelson, you have become a symbol of hope and admiration for people in this region and millions all over the world. We are happy to see you in our midst, here in Botswana, where our people can express their support and love for you in person. They have worked hard and waited long for your release. Although the struggle for a democratic South Africa, which you have come to symbolize, is far from over, it gives us much satisfaction to see you here in person and to see you back in action against apartheid.

8. Your wife, Winnie, has been an inspiration to you and many during the long years of your incarceration. We admire her courage and dedication to her family and to the cause of her people. We also admire her fortitude under tremendous political and emotional stress during those lonely years. Together you are a team.

9. You and your colleagues, with whom you spent almost three decades in prison, are an asset to the ANC. You have timeously filled the gap left by the temporary absence of Oliver Tambo, President of the ANC, whose speedy recovery we all look forward to. During your term of imprisonment, Oliver Tambo provided dynamic leadership for your organization and for the people of South Africa as a whole. Although he was leading a banned organization from outside the borders of his own country, he inspired your people with the hope that some day, a solution to the South African problem would be addressed.

10. The ANC has, throughout its history, advocated a peaceful settlement to the problem of South Africa. For many years this was rejected by successive white minority régimes. The persistence and unity of purpose of the ANC and other anti-apartheid organizations, backed by supreme sacrifice and self-denial, have finally borne fruit. This is self-evident as signified by the new thinking in the present Government of President de Klerk, which has given hope to a negotiated settlement.

11. Bagaetsho, it is now my pleasure to invite our distinguished guest to address you.

ANNEX II

Statement by the Vice-President of the African National Congress
on the occasion of his visit to Botswana

I am honoured and privileged to share some of my thoughts with you on this historic occasion and in doing so I place on record the deep gratitude that the vast masses of South Africa owe to the Government and people of Botswana, our neighbour and trusted friend. I pay tribute to departed heroes of Botswana. Towering above them all is Seretse Kgama, first President of Botswana, and Professor Matthews, Pula, Botswana.

The past, the present and the future bind Botswana and South Africa together from the colonial days and the struggle for freedom which I am sure will eventually result in a powerful free democratic southern Africa. I visualize a southern Africa, great, prosperous, economically interdependent and making a great contribution to a rejuvenated Africa, playing its mighty role in the world.

Indeed destiny has bound us solidly together and it is that destiny that beckons us to the call of freedom, which we in South Africa so clearly articulated even before the African National Congress was founded in 1912 - 78 years ago. And history has recorded the great role of such outstanding Africans as Professor Z. K. Matthews in shaping the policies of the ANC and in giving my country the Freedom Charter, a historic document for the formulation of which Professor Matthews and I were among the 156 persons charged with high treason.

The generation that produced such leaders as Chief Albert John Luthuli and Professor Z. K. Matthews drew strength from the days of Dr. Seme, Reverend John Dube and their cofounders of the ANC. And we do the same today and pay tribute to them for their vision of a great and free Africa freed from the bondage of imperialism and neo-imperialism which had stultified the development of a whole continent and other parts of the world.

Botswana and South Africa have a proud past. And I add that Botswana and South Africa have a proud present because their people are bound by their peoples' dedication to the cause of non-racialism and to the cause of political and economic democracy. With that heritage we shall march together to a bright future where human dignity and merit will come into their own and ethical values fully restored.

Let me on this occasion say how proud we are in the role of Botswana at the United Nations, at the OAU and as a front-line State in solidly standing with the oppressed of South Africa in our long battle for freedom in which after long decades of non-violence against institutional violence we were reluctantly compelled to adopt armed struggle purely for self-defence. If we had not adopted the armed struggle as an integral part of our freedom strategy, I am certain that I would not be addressing you today. In great humility, I add that without the armed struggle, without the economic sanctions our internal struggle for liberation in South Africa would have faced unsurmountable difficulties.

/...

It is the external pressure of sanctions, the armed struggle as a weapon of defence and the internal defiance against racism which has created the present climate which made possible the discussions within Pretoria on the removal of obstacles to negotiations.

I don't have to tell Botswana that the ANC and the oppressed of South Africa are dedicated to peace. The ANC wants a non-racial democratic South Africa with a more powerful economy than it has at present. We do not want to disrupt our economy; we want to improve and build it and save it from the harm already caused to it by apartheid. Increased productivity is our cherished aim.

We love South Africa. We respect and admire our neighbours who have emerged as free nations. We know that all the free nations surrounding us, including free Namibia, are built on the only sound democratic foundation of one person, one vote of equal value without preserving minority rights - a measure to extend white privileges. We in South Africa want no more but what is more important we want no less. We want our racial past to be forgotten and we want all black and white South Africans fully protected against any future emergence of racial domination. We are fully dedicated to a Bill of Rights guaranteeing each and every human being basic rights as South Africans have no racial labels.

It is proper and fitting that I on behalf of the ANC make our position clear to all at this start of the long journey of thanksgiving and rededication that will take me to so many different places in three different continents.

Botswana has no economic vested interests in South Africa which militate against her understanding our liberation struggle, its present strategies or its future political and economic policies.

But there are others who have for centuries benefited from the economic exploitation of South Africa, nay the whole of Africa which had come under imperialist domination. There are powerful economic forces, who remained silent and had no objections to nationalization by the whites of our railways, harbours, airways and Sasol and Iscor, and now in this period of transition regard nationalization as a horror and falsely present it as a new and disruptive concept. Their reactions do not come from their concern for the well-being of the people of southern Africa, but purely from greed, self-interest and continuing undeserved profits at the expense of the poor.

If they don't like the word "nationalism" let them not use it. Let them, however, not run away from the fact that in South Africa the vast masses have been denied resources to which they are entitled as their birthrights. A small white caste has appropriated for itself the bulk of our resources and we want ways and means of an equitable distribution of these resources so that all South Africans can share with equality. That is what the Freedom Charter is all about and that is what was high treason in the eyes of the rulers and thus the 1956 Treason Trial took place.

And now when President F. W. de Klerk has moved away in some measures from his own past, we categorically say to him and to the world that apartheid is not yet dead. It is alive. But the ANC is even more alive and is step by step ending apartheid. We have noted the changes that have taken place in South Africa and I have spoken of the courage of President de Klerk but a great task lies ahead of all of us before negotiations begin and apartheid ends.

That will be the time to bring cease-fire into existence, end sanctions and the armed struggle. If sanctions are now ended then this would be tantamount to stabbing the liberation struggle in the back. To end the armed struggle now would be an act of immaturity and not in the interest of the forces, black and white, now working for a genuine new South Africa - a South Africa of freedom, justice, peace and greater economic prosperity.

We have come to Botswana at the very beginning of our long journey to tell the world what we stand for. It is the right and correct beginning. Botswana is indeed an integral part of us. We want you to give us that encouragement today that you have given us as a people in the past. Mr. President, we in the name of the African National Congress and the people of South Africa greet you, your Government and the people of Botswana in the name of freedom. We want with your help to see South Africa emerge freed from racism and oppression so that like Botswana we can take our rightful place in a freed Africa and make our contribution to the peace and prosperity of the world. AFRICA MAYIBUYE.



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/45/305
S/21345
7 June 1990
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-fifth session
Item 35 of the preliminary list*
THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-fifth year

Letter dated 6 June 1990 from the Permanent Representative of
Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text of the Final Statement of the Emergency Arab Summit Conference held at Baghdad from 28 to 30 May 1990.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under item 35 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Abdul Amir A. AL-ANBARI
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

* A/45/50.

ANNEX

Final Statement adopted at the Emergency Arab Summit Conference
held at Baghdad from 28 to 30 May 1990

At the kind invitation of His Excellency Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of the Republic of Iraq, Their Majesties, Their Excellencies and Their Highnesses the Kings, Presidents and Amirs of the Arab States held an extraordinary Summit Conference at Baghdad from 4 to 6 Dhu'lqa'dah A.H. 1410, corresponding to 28 to 30 May A.D. 1990.

The major rubric of the Conference

As its major topic, the Conference discussed the threats being made against pan-Arab national security and the adoption of the necessary measures to counter them.

Welcome for the establishment of the Republic of Yemen

At the commencement of its work, the Conference welcomed the establishment of the fraternal Republic of Yemen on 22 May 1990. It expressed its full support and backing for the Republic of Yemen and conveyed its sincere congratulations to the great Yemeni people and to its dedicated national leadership. The Conference views this unification as an embodiment of the principles of magnanimity, high-mindedness, sincerity and brotherliness, as an indication of the capacity and unlimited potential of the Arabs to overcome difficulties and obstacles and as a magnificent example that will stimulate the Arab nation to pursue the achievement of its legitimate aspirations for complete unity, progress, cultural advancement and the assertion of its liberal humanitarian mission.

Changes at the international level, and the unified Arab position

In the framework of an objective, comprehensive and thorough analysis aimed at the formulation of a joint Arab position thereon, the Conference conducted an evaluation of the current inter-Arab situation, the changes taking place in the international arena and the threats posed to pan-Arab national security. It considered their present and future impact on the Arab nation and on the rights of the people of Palestine and higher Arab interests in particular.

While welcoming moves towards international détente, co-operation among peoples, a halt to the arms race, the banishment of the spectre of devastating wars and the establishment of international peace and security on the foundation of a common balance of interests, mutual respect, sovereignty and independence, the Conference is fully conscious that these changes, with all their positive and negative consequences, make it more than ever essential for the Arab nation to rely on its own capacities in coping with direct threats to its national security and in dealing with a reshaped international environment in which the Arab nation must maintain a status appropriate to its long history and its cultural endowment.

The valiant Palestinian intifadah

With great pride, the Conference saluted the endurance of the Palestinian Arab people under brutal Israeli occupation, the escalation of the valiant Palestinian intifadah in confronting savage repression on the part of the Israeli authorities and the precious sacrifices made daily by the people of Palestine for the purpose of liberating its occupied homeland and establishing an independent State on its national soil and with its capital at Jerusalem under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The Conference stressed the need for all forms of material, political, governmental and popular support to be made available and for the strengthening of supporting activities at the national, regional and international levels in order to ensure the continuation and expansion of the intifadah and the achievement of its lofty goal of liberation, independence and sovereignty.

Jewish immigration to Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories

The Conference addressed itself to the grave dangers arising out of directed and organized Jewish immigration to Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories: its implicit violation of the rights of the Palestinian people in its territory and its homeland; the consequences that Zionism is planning for it to have with the goal of expelling that people from its national territory; and the perpetuation and expansion of Israeli occupation through stepped-up Israeli settlement activities and the expulsion of Palestinian citizens and the confiscation of their property and land for the absorption of Jewish immigrants with a view to realizing the so-called "Greater Israel" plan. That plan is confirmed by statements made by Israeli officials and by the new maps that they have proposed for the achievement of their well-known expansionist ambitions.

The Conference is fully convinced that the immigration of Soviet and other Jews to Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories is a fresh act of aggression against the rights of the Palestinian people, a grave danger to the Arab nation and a blatant violation of human rights, the principles of international law and the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

Jewish immigration as a danger to national security

The Conference affirms that this extensive and organized undertaking represents a grave threat to pan-Arab national security, that it demands to be addressed in that perspective and in a collective manner and that it requires that all necessary measures should be taken to protect the rights of the Palestinian people and pan-Arab national security.

Condemnation of Jewish immigration, and illegality of settlements

The Conference, strongly condemning the immigration of Jews to Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories, calls upon the States directly involved in that immigration in particular and on the international community in general to

/...

take action for a speedy end to the Israeli immigration and settlement scheme. It calls for a guarantee of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to return to its homeland in accordance with United Nations General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 1948. It affirms the illegality of the establishment of Israeli settlements and the need for a halt to their construction, the dismantling of those that have been built and the creation of an international mechanism to monitor Israeli activities in this field.

The Conference further calls upon all States to refrain from providing any assistance or loans to the Israeli Government that might facilitate the settlement of immigrants in Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories.

Call for the formation of an international observer mission

The Conference stresses the need for a reappraisal of Arab relations with other States in the light of their positions on the issues of Palestinian national rights and Jewish immigration. The Conference calls upon the United Nations to meet its responsibilities, in accordance with the Charter, General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and the relevant international conventions, to ensure that Jewish immigrants are not settled in the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and it calls for the formation of an international observer mission to ascertain that fact and for action to be taken for the adoption of a Security Council resolution to that effect.

Political efforts for the achievement of a just and comprehensive peace in the region

The Conference analysed the present conjuncture in the inter-Arab arena, and it reviewed the political efforts being made for the achievement of a just and comprehensive peace in the region. It expressed its conviction that escalating tension, which threatens to lead to an eruption, has its origin in the continuing Israeli occupation of Palestine and other Arab territories, the continuing denial to the Palestinian Arab people of its inalienable national rights and the continuing policies of aggression, intimidation and expansion pursued by the Israeli authorities. The Conference regards the United States of America as having prime responsibility for this situation, as the State which provides Israel with the military capacity, the financial assistance and the political cloak without which it would be unable to persist in such policies in defiance of the will of the international community.

The International Conference, the Palestinian peace initiative, and the resolutions of the Arab Summits

In its commitment to the Palestinian peace initiative and the resolutions adopted by the Arab Summits, in particular those held at Algiers in 1988 and Casablanca in 1989, the Conference affirms that the convening of the International Conference under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, on an equal footing, is now taking on an urgent and imperative character. The

/...

Conference affirms the commitment of the Arab States to the belief that the question of Palestine represents the core of the Arab-Zionist conflict and that a just and lasting solution to the human tragedy of the Palestinian people and crisis in the region lies in ensuring the exercise of the inalienable national rights of that people, including the right to return, to exercise self-determination and to establish an independent Palestinian State with its capital at Jerusalem.

Acclamation of the endurance of the Lebanese and Palestinian masses in southern Lebanon

The Conference further acclaimed the endurance of the Palestinian masses alongside their Lebanese brothers in southern Lebanon and their participation in repulsing Israeli land, sea and air attacks against villages and Palestinian camps in the South.

Development of Arab relations with the States of Eastern Europe

Given the ongoing changes in the countries of Eastern Europe, the Conference recommended the reappraisal of Arab relations with those States in the light of the positions adopted by them on the question of Palestine and on the basis of mutual interests.

Expression of satisfaction at the outcome of the Euro-Arab Ministerial Meeting

The Conference expressed its satisfaction at the outcome of the Euro-Arab Ministerial Meeting held at the end of 1989. Member States decided to make an active contribution to the development of the Euro-Arab dialogue and to endeavour to promote it in order to strengthen relations of co-operation and friendship between the two groupings.

Growth of international support for the cause of Palestine

The Conference notes with satisfaction and appreciation that international support for the just cause of the people of Palestine is growing and that an increasing number of States have recognized the State of Palestine.

Condemnation of the positions adopted by the United States Congress

The Conference expresses its censure and condemnation of the positions of partiality and political protectionism adopted by the United States Congress and the large-scale military and economic support for Israel that characterizes its positions and resolutions, most recently the nugatory resolutions on Jerusalem and on support and funding for Jewish immigration, which encourage settlement in the occupied territories.

Jerusalem: capital of the State of Palestine

The Conference affirms the religious and political status of Jerusalem and considers it to be an integral part of Palestine and the capital of the State. It

/...

rejects any encroachment on its religious and legal status as a flagrant violation of international conventions and resolutions.

The Conference endorses the decision of the Al-Quds Committee of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to hold an Islamic-Christian conference on the protection of Islamic and Christian Holy Places.

Condemnation of the United States Congress resolution on Jerusalem

In this connection, the Conference condemns the resolutions adopted by the United States Senate and House of Representatives. The Conference asserted in that regard that the Arab States would take political and economic measures against any State that considered Jerusalem to be the capital of Israel.

International protection for the Palestinian people

In the face of the persistence of the Israeli authorities in their heinous crimes against Palestinians, the Conference demands protection for the Palestinian people, under international supervision and United Nations auspices, against deliberately planned extermination and expulsion, as a preparatory step to the exercise of its right to self-determination and national independence.

The unified Arab position

The Conference is fully confident that rights can be safeguarded, the land protected and the Holy Places defended only through unanimity, the closing of ranks, unity of purpose, the strengthening of Arab solidarity, the settlement of inter-Arab differences, constant struggle by all possible means, the mobilization of all Arab capacities in the service of issues affecting the national destiny and energetic and effective action on all fronts and in all regional and international arenas.

On this occasion, the Conference records its deep gratitude to all States, organizations, bodies and personalities that have supported the national rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation, and it calls upon them for increased material and moral support for the promotion of justice and peace in the world and an end to Israel's arrogance and its inhuman practices.

Opposition to United States attempts to have the resolution equating zionism with racism rescinded

The Conference strongly opposed the United States attempts to have General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) rescinded, namely the resolution determining that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination. It called for intensified efforts to thwart those attempts.

Threats and hostile campaigns against Iraq

The Conference accorded great attention to the threats, hostile and biased political and media campaigns and scientific and technical boycott measures to which Iraq is being subjected as well as to the dangers that they pose to the sovereignty of a State member of the League of Arab States and their impact on pan-Arab national security.

Active Arab solidarity with Iraq

The Conference, affirming its commitment to the Pact of the League of Arab States and to the Joint Defence and Economic Co-operation Treaty between the States of the Arab League, strongly condemns those threats and hostile campaigns and measures, affirms its active solidarity with fraternal Iraq and cautions against the continuation of campaigns which have the aim of impinging on its sovereignty and encroaching on its national security with a view to preparing and facilitating aggression against it.

Iraq's right to ensure and protect its national security

The Conference affirms Iraq's right to take all necessary measures to ensure and protect its national security and to provide itself with the prerequisites for development, including the possession of advanced scientific and technological equipment and its utilization for internationally lawful purposes.

The Conference further affirms the right of Iraq and of all Arab States to legitimate self-defence in response to aggression by whatever means they deem appropriate in order to ensure their security and sovereignty.

Solidarity with Jordan in strengthening its resolute stand

Fully aware of the organic link between national security and pan-Arab national security, and in appreciation of the steadfast and constant stance of Jordan on the longest lines of confrontation with the enemy, the Conference condemns Israel's settlement policy and its expansionist schemes, including the plan to settle new Jewish immigrants in the occupied Arab territories, which represent a direct threat to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and are thus a menace to the Arab nation and constitute aggression against it.

Support for Jordan

The Conference affirms its full commitment to the defence and protection of the national security of Jordan as an integral part of the national security of the Arab nation. Support for Jordan, solidarity with it and provision of the assistance required if it is to maintain its steadfastness are a national duty, given that it is a forward base of the Arab nation that protects its borders, defends its existence and helps to ward off the dangers threatening it. The Conference decided that support should be provided to Jordan through bilateral consultations so as to enable it to consolidate its steadfast position and

strengthen its capacities in all fields, thereby providing a basic prop for the Palestinian cause, support to the blessed Palestinian intifadah and assistance to the Palestinian people in its steadfast adherence to its occupied land.

Condemnation of the United States threats against Libya

The Conference condemned United States threats to use force against the great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and denounced the extension by the United States Administration of the economic blockade against it. It calls for the blockade to be lifted. The Conference affirmed the right of the great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to acquire modern technology for the achievement of development and progress. In its commitment to the Pact of the League of Arab States and the Joint Defence and Economic Co-operation Treaty between the States of the Arab League, and in an endeavour to strengthen the foundations of international peace and security, the Conference renewed its solidarity with the great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in coping with the economic blockade and the United States threats.

Solidarity with the Sudan and Somalia

With a view to strengthening security and stability in the Horn of Africa, the Conference affirmed its active and fraternal solidarity with the Sudan and Somalia against any threat to the national integrity of their territories or peoples.

Acclaim for the independence of Namibia

The Conference, acclaiming the independence of Namibia and the release of the African leader Nelson Mandela, and commending the struggle of the African peoples against apartheid and for freedom and progress, affirms the convergence of the Afro-Arab struggle and the closeness of Afro-Arab co-operation. It cautions against the danger for the security of Arabs and Africans alike of the wide-ranging co-operation between the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria, particularly in the nuclear weapons field.

Afro-Arab co-operation

The Conference called for action to stimulate Afro-Arab co-operation by means of close collaboration between the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States and the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, in consultation with the specialized organizations and institutions of LAS and OAU, in the implementation of the projects already approved by the Standing Committee on Afro-Arab Co-operation.

Developments in the situation between Iraq and Iran

The Conference reviewed developments in the situation between Iraq and Iran and the continued suffering and concern of the prisoners of war and their families despite the cessation of active hostilities on the entry into force of the cease-fire on 20 August 1988. The Conference noted with great satisfaction the

peace initiatives taken by Iraq, most recently the peace message addressed by Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of the Republic of Iraq, to the Iranian leadership.

Resolution 598 (1987) as a comprehensive peace plan, and ensuring the rights of Iraq and its sovereignty over the Shatt al-Arab

The Conference, reaffirming its resolution 182 adopted at Casablanca, calls for continued efforts for the achievement of a comprehensive and lasting peace between Iraq and Iran on the basis of Security Council resolution 598 (1987), as a comprehensive peace plan, and of the agreement of 8 August 1988. This should be done by means of direct negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations so as to guarantee the rights of Iraq and its sovereignty over its territory, particularly its historic right to sovereignty over the Shatt al-Arab, non-intervention in its internal affairs, the security of the Arabian Gulf and the freedom of shipping in international waters.

Release of prisoners of war

The Conference called for stepped-up efforts to be made at the various levels for the release of prisoners of war on both sides and their immediate repatriation, in implementation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 598 (1987) and the third Geneva Convention of 1949, as an issue of an independent legal and humanitarian character. It calls upon the United Nations, upon all international, regional, governmental and non-governmental organizations and bodies and upon the High Contracting Parties to the third Geneva Convention to meet their responsibilities and to take all the political and other measures in their power for the speedy release of the Iraqi and Iranian prisoners of war.

The Lebanese crisis

The Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Fahd Bin Abdul-Aziz of Saudi Arabia, on behalf of his colleagues, His Majesty King Hassan II of Morocco and His Excellency Mr. Chadi Bendjedid, President of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, addressed a letter to the Arab leaders transmitting the report prepared by the High-level Arab Tripartite Committee. The report contained an evaluation by the three leaders of the current situation in Lebanon and their recommendations on the steps to be taken to promote the implementation of the Taif Agreement and strengthen Lebanese legitimacy. In that light, the Conference discussed the various dimensions of the Lebanese crisis and their repercussions on Lebanon and on the Arab nation as a whole. It further reviewed the steps and measures that had been taken in Lebanon since the signing of the Charter of National Reconciliation following the meetings held by the Lebanese deputies at Taif under the auspices of the Tripartite Committee. Accordingly, the Conference expressed its deep pain at the bloody events taking place in Lebanon and its concern at the suffering of the Lebanese people. It affirmed that fighting was not a solution to the Lebanese crisis and could only further complicate and prolong it, would have an adverse impact on the integrity of the State, its people and its institutions, and would impede the process of recovery, reconciliation and peace. The Arab Summit was anxious for that process to continue so that it could bring an end to the tragedy

/...

and restore security, stability and prosperity to the country. It also expressed its deep grief that there were obstacles to the peace and reconciliation process begun by the adoption of the Charter of National Reconciliation, and it stressed its continued support for the legitimate Lebanese authorities and its unconditional readiness to do all in its power to bring an end to the Lebanese tragedy.

The Conference further condemned the repeated acts of aggression carried out by Israel against Lebanese territory and expressed its great admiration for the endurance of citizens in occupied southern Lebanon who valiantly continued to resist Israeli occupation and repeated Zionist acts of aggression against their land. In this context, the Conference called upon the international community to take action for the implementation of the Security Council resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, in particular resolution 425 (1978).

The Conference also affirmed that the Taif Agreement was the appropriate framework for safeguarding the interests of all Lebanese without exception and that it represented the way in which Lebanon could be extricated from continued violence and security and peace achieved.

In that connection, the Conference requested the Tripartite Committee to endeavour to follow up the implementation of the Taif Agreement. It affirmed its continued support for the efforts of the Committee and its readiness to do all that the peace process in Lebanon might require so that that fraternal country could regain its unity and independence and so that the authority and sovereignty of the Lebanese State could be extended over all Lebanese territory.

The Conference further decided to call for the establishment of an international fund to assist Lebanon and enable it to revive its institutions, operate its public services, rebuild its infrastructure and help it in its efforts to reconstruct and reinvigorate its economic structures. It called upon the international community to participate actively in that fund.

The scientific and cultural challenge

The Conference recognizes that the greatest challenge facing the Arab nation in the last decade of the twentieth century is the scientific and cultural challenge of securing a stake in the future and making an active contribution once again to the enrichment of human civilization on a basis of international understanding founded on tolerance, friendship and peaceful co-operation.

The right of the Arab nation to use science and technology freely

Given the inalienable right of peoples to full development and to the utilization of the achievements of science and technology in the service of mankind, the Conference affirms the inalienable right of the Arab nation to development and to the utilization of science and technology for the benefit of Arab citizens and all mankind.

Lifting of the scientific and technical embargo on the Arab nation

The Conference rejects all policies aimed at impeding the scientific and technological progress of the Arab nation as hostile acts incompatible with the legitimate human right of the Arabs to ensure for themselves a fitting, modern and civilized life in such a way as to ensure peace, security and stability. It points out that any individual or collective measures taken against any Arab country or countries that impose special restrictions inhibiting the transfer of technology to any such country will make it necessary for appropriate pan-Arab positions of solidarity to be adopted in order to preserve Arab interests.

The Conference further calls upon the developed countries to facilitate the transfer of technology to the Arab States on an equal footing with other nations and in a manner in keeping with the mutual interests of the Arab States and the countries in question.

Elimination of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East region

The Arab States, while supporting international efforts for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction with a view to ensuring peace and normal human life, which efforts have only been successful in the context of serious endeavours for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the reduction of international tension, affirms that such a process in the Middle East region must be based on the complete elimination of all weapons of mass destruction in the region and not of one type of weapon alone. It must also take place in the framework of a comprehensive and just settlement to the conflict in the region, and it must be accompanied by equal access to technology, including nuclear technology for peaceful purposes and conventional weapons, for all parties in the region without discrimination and without partiality towards any of the parties to the conflict.

The Conference points out that focusing on the elimination of only one type of weapon of mass destruction in the Middle East region means, in essence, the adoption of a selective approach for the region.

Appraisal of the role of the League

The Conference affirmed its pride in the national role performed by the League of Arab States, the primary national institution, which provided a comprehensive institutional framework for joint Arab action. It stressed the need to strengthen its effectiveness, to reinforce its organs, to provide the necessary resources for the implementation of its programmes of action, to co-ordinate its work with that of other Arab regional groupings and to consolidate its links with international and regional organizations.

Amendment of the Pact of the League

The Conference decided to request the Arab Ministers for Foreign Affairs to complete the procedures for the amendment of the Pact of the League of Arab States and to submit their recommendations to the next Summit Conference, to be held in the Arab Republic of Egypt.

The Conference reviewed the "Draft Charter of the Arab Union", submitted by Libya, and it was of the view that that document should be considered as a draft amendment to the Pact of the League of Arab States.

Periodicity of Summit Conferences

The Conference decided that the Arab Summit Conferences should be held on a regular annual basis in November each year.

It further decided that the next regular Summit should be held in the Arab Republic of Egypt in November 1990.

Monitoring of Jewish immigration, and the Arab position with regard to international economic groupings

In view of the importance of monitoring Jewish immigration and of the Arab position with regard to international economic groupings, the Conference decided to invite the Arab Ministers for Foreign Affairs and the Arab Ministers of Economic Affairs and Finance to hold an urgent meeting, within two months, in order to examine those two issues, and submit the necessary recommendations on modalities for dealing with them to the next Summit, and likewise to study the encouragement of Arab investment in the Arab world.

Great appreciation for the role of President Saddam Hussein in the success of the Conference

The Conference expressed its great appreciation to His Excellency Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of the Republic of Iraq, for the valuable efforts he had made to ensure the success of the Conference and the sagacity with which he had conducted its meetings. It had thus achieved important results which would assist in strengthening joint Arab action and protecting pan-Arab national security.

The Conference also expressed its deep gratitude to Iraq for hosting the Conference and for its smooth organization and meticulous preparation. The Conference pays tribute to the combatant people of Iraq and conveys to it its sincere congratulations on the clear victory it has achieved in defence of the sovereignty and dignity of the Arab people at the Eastern gateway of its mighty homeland.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/21346
7 June 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 6 JUNE 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL

With reference to the letter dated 23 May 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations (S/21329), enclosing The Washington Post article of 3 May 1990, on the crime of genocide at Halabja on 18 March 1988 when Iraqi Kurds were massacred by chemical weapons, I have the honour to state the following.

It is the oldest trick in the book to wait until the dust is settled and then try to share the blame for your crime with someone else. This is what the letter of Iraq's Permanent Representative and its enclosure, i.e., the fruit of their public relations campaign and patronage, is all about.

In May 1988, the Government of Iraq topped its dark record of war crimes by yet an ultimate crime; gassing its own population - killing more than 5,000 Iraqi Kurdish men, women and children under the absurd pretext of fighting Kurdish dissidence. The world was shocked, and as condemnation from various capitals poured into Baghdad, the Kurdish population poured into the Islamic Republic of Iran in dire need of emergency medical care. Security Council document S/19726 dated 4 April 1988 gives a token pictorial account of this gruesome Iraqi genocide about which the Secretary-General of the United Nations issued a public statement on 25 March 1988, which reads in part:

"Sadly, there is considerable and most serious evidence in the public domain that chemical weapons have again been used by Iraqi forces in the past few days, causing a high number of casualties, including civilians in both Iran and Iraq."

In this connection, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) expressed its readiness to the Islamic Republic of Iran to provide emergency assistance for the victims of use of chemical weapons which killed a great number of civilians in the province of Sulaymaniyah. (ICRC press release No. 1567, dated 23 March 1988.)

The manifestation of a sense of international outrage over Iraq's use of chemical weapons against its own people went beyond the public statements of the

international organizations. A large number of States from all five continents issued statements in condemnation of the use of chemical weapon by Iraq in and around Halabja.

The request by the Permanent Representative of Iraq to circulate this article as a document of the Security Council is another evidence of Iraq's acknowledgement of the use of massive chemical weapons in Halabja - for The Washington Post article of 3 March 1990, however unreliable, says in unambiguous terms that Iraq "began using gas against Iranian troops in 1983", that Iraq employed the "deadly chemical agents ... on a broad scale by the end of war" in 1988, and that the "Halabja massacre became the most horrifying symbol of Iraqi chemical warfare".

Relying on intelligence sources, which could be anything or nothing at all, the article levelled baseless allegations against the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, denoting that the Islamic Republic of Iran also used chemical weapons. In this respect the article has two major flaws; it is undocumented and it is factually wrong. The article is based wholly on what the author has called a "Defense Department study". On 7 May 1990, in response to a question about this article, Captain Grizze, a spokesman for the Pentagon, denied the existence of such a study on the Iran-Iraq conflict. The second flaw is the article's reasoning that since the Islamic Republic of Iran announced on 20 March 1988 that many Halabja victims had died from cyanide poisoning, and since Iraq does not use cyanide gas, therefore the Islamic Republic of Iran must have used cyanide at Halabja.

This reasoning has a tortured logic to begin with and it is factually wrong. Iraq has cyanide and it has used cyanide not only at Halabja but also on other occasions. Iranian physicians and toxicologists gained a tremendous amount of experience in the clinical detection of chemical agents as well as the treatment of the victims of Iraq's chemical warfare during 1983-1988. Their initial conclusions as to the type of chemical agents Iraq has used have usually been confirmed by independent international groups of experts who have carried out on-site investigations of the area affected and conducted laboratory tests on their samples in Europe. The announcement on 20 March 1988 that Iraq used cyanide at Halabja was no exception.

On-site investigation by independent experts and/or clinical treatment of the victims of Iraq's use of chemical weapon who were treated outside the Islamic Republic of Iran have confirmed that Iraq has used cyanide. The following reports are but two examples:

(a) Report of Artesen Zonder Grenzen MSF, Holland, on the investigation of the following experts on Iraq's use of chemical weapon (p. 11):

Mr. J. de Milliano, MD- Director MSF- Amsterdam,

Mr. R. Moreels, MD- Chairman MSF- Belgium,

Mr. H. D. Dons- Pharmacist Laboratory of Toxicology, University of Ghent;

(b) Report of the Department of Toxicology at the State University of Ghent on the samples from the victims of Iraq's use of chemical weapon (No. 88/NY/PJ 881) which concludes that cyanide or its derivatives like cyanogen chloride was used (p. 6).

The allegation in the article as to the Islamic Republic of Iran's use of chemical weapons is absurd. It is nothing but a distortion of history for short-sighted political gains through an outrageous misuse of a respectable medium by the Iraqi public relations campaign. While categorically denying such a baseless and unfounded allegation, which is pure fabrication in a desperate attempt to shape Iraq's image in the eight years of the imposed war, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran is of the opinion that this type of deceptive public relations manoeuvres will not, under any circumstances, diminish the burden of the responsibility of the Iraqi culprits.

It would be highly appreciated if this letter were circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Kamal KHARRAZI
Ambassador
Permanent Representative



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/44/954
S/21347
7 June 1990
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-fourth session
Agenda item 34

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-fifth year

THE SITUATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA: THREATS
TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND
PEACE INITIATIVES

Letter dated 7 June 1990 from the Permanent Representatives
of Spain and Venezuela to the United Nations addressed to
the Secretary-General

We have the honour to write to transmit to you the text issued at the conclusion of the press conference given by the President of the Republic of Venezuela and the President of the Spanish Government concerning the process of demobilizing the Nicaraguan resistance (see annex).

We should be grateful if you would arrange for this note and its annex to be circulated as an official document of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 34, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Andrés AGUILAR
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Venezuela
to the United Nations

(Signed) Francisco VILLAR
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Spain
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Text issued at the conclusion of the press conference given by
the President of the Republic of Venezuela and the President
of the Spanish Government

(Madrid, 7 June 1990)

1. On the occasion of the official and working visit which His Excellency Mr. Carlos Andrés Pérez, President of the Republic of Venezuela, made to Spain from 5 to 7 June 1990, the President of the Government of Spain and the President of the Republic of Venezuela reviewed the situation in Central America, with particular attention to Nicaragua.
2. Having regard to their responsibility as Members of the United Nations and prominent contributors to and participants in the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA), and after noting that substantial progress has been made recently in the process of demobilizing the Nicaraguan resistance, they expressed concern at the prospect of the process not being completed by 10 June. Failure to comply with the Managua Protocol of 30 May, which was freely and responsibly signed by the Government and the Nicaraguan resistance, would endanger the country's internal stability.
3. With the aim of making a further contribution to the peace process in the framework of the Esquipulas Agreements, the Governments of Spain and Venezuela would be prepared, at the request of the parties, to agree to an extension of ONUCA's mandate as it relates to this specific matter for a short and clearly defined period, with a definite date being set for the completion of its task under the supervision of the Security Council itself.
4. The Governments of Spain and Venezuela reaffirm their full support for the excellent work of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) and the outstanding performance of ONUCA and its senior command in carrying out the important assignment entrusted to the Group.
